



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 20, 2004

Ms. Barbara L. Quirk  
Law Offices of William M. McKamie, P.C.  
13750 San Pedro, Suite 640  
San Antonio, Texas 78232

OR2004-3185

Dear Ms. Quirk:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID#199848.

The City of Boerne (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a copy of the "Inter-governmental Agreement/By Laws" between the TML Risk Pool and the city. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You contend that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 101.104 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. Section 101.104 provides:

- (a) Neither the existence nor the amount of insurance held by a governmental unit is admissible in the trial of a suit under [the Texas Tort Claims Act].
- (b) Neither the existence nor the amount of the insurance is subject to discovery.

Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 101.104. Section 101.104 provides that insurance information is not discoverable or admissible as evidence during litigation proceeding under the Texas Tort Claims Act, chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code. *See City of Bedford v. Schattman*, 776 S.W.2d 812, 813-14 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 1989, orig. proceeding) (protection from producing evidence of insurance coverage under section 101.104 is limited

to actions brought under the Tort Claims Act). Section 101.104, however, is a civil discovery privilege and does not make insurance information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 3 (1990) (provisions of section 101.104 “are not relevant to the availability of the information to the public”); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JM-1048 (1989); Open Records Decision Nos. 647 at 2 (1996) (information that may be privileged in the civil discovery context may not be withheld from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code), 575 at 2 (1990) (stating explicitly that discovery privileges are not covered under statutory predecessor to section 552.101). Thus, we determine that the information at issue may not be withheld from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with section 101.104 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code.

You also contend that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. Section 552.103 provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

The city has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.--Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an

attorney for a potential opposing party.<sup>1</sup> Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

You have provided a letter from the requestor to the city. In it, the requestor seeks reimbursement from the city for expenses incurred by the requestor as a result of purported delays in the delivery of sewer services by the city to a particular project. In the letter, the requestor requests that the city notify the city’s insurance provider of his claim. However, the requestor makes no specific threat to sue in the letter, and you have provided no other evidence that he has so threatened. Therefore, based on our review of your arguments and the submitted information, we conclude you have not met your burden of establishing that litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the city received the present request, and the city may not withhold the requested information under section 552.103. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure, we conclude that the city must release the requested information to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records

---

<sup>1</sup>In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).


will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cary Grace", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Cary Grace  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ECG/lmt

Ref: ID#199848

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Philip P. Bakke  
President  
Bakke Development Corp.  
1250 NE Loop 410, Suite 320  
San Antonio, Texas 78209  
(w/o enclosures)